

REMARKS

The claims are 1-10.

Claim 1 corresponds to claim 1 as filed in the response of March 10, 2003 in parent application Serial No. 10/114,258.

Claims 2-4 correspond to claims 2-4 as originally filed and claims 5-9 correspond to claims 7-11 as originally filed.

Claim 10 finds support on page 7, second full paragraph.

The patentability of the above claims will now be discussed.

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 were rejected in the Final Rejection of May 19, 2003 as being unpatentable over Hatakeyama in parent application Serial No. 10/114,258. With regard to Final Rejection paragraph 11, the Applicants submit herewith comparative data at the upper limit of 1.5 in Rule 132 Declaration form.

The Declaration establishes the critical importance of the Mw_{\max}/Mw_{\min} being less than 1.5.


The unobvious advantages of such ratio are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hatakeyama.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-12 on the ground of double patenting of claims 1-4 of Applicants' earlier U.S. 6,444,394, there is submitted herewith a Terminal Disclaimer which disclaims the terminal portion of any patent maturing from the present application which extends beyond the expiration date of Applicants' earlier patent.

Favorable action is now requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazufumi SATO et al.

By 
Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/da
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 20, 2003